

## REMARKS

### I. 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 57-61, 63, 64 and 66-79 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Franchi (U.S. Patent No. 5,770,533) in view of Gimmon (U.S. Patent No. 5,096,195) and further in view of Paulsen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,712,698). The Examiner has also rejected claims 62 and 65 as being unpatentable over Franchi in view of Gimmon, Paulsen and Walker (U.S. Patent No. 6,024,640) or Rocco (U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0035425). Applicants have canceled claims 57-79 and added new independent claim 80 and dependent claims 81-86.

Claim 80 seeks to overcome the above-cited references. More particularly, claim 80 recites said game controller configured to transmit said at least one data encryption key to said at least one gaming device via said first communication channel automatically and without involvement of personnel of a gaming establishment housing said dispenser. In other words, the system automatically (i.e., without intervention by casino personnel) transmits the data encryption key to each gaming device responsive to each gaming device being dispensed.

Franchi provides a general description of the “RSAT holder” downloading the player-operated RSAT 1600 and RSAT 1700 with financial data from a player’s game card, such as a credit card. Franchi does not describe a data encryption key being transmitted or downloaded to the RSAT. Indeed, Franchi is silent on the issue of connection and/or communication between the RSAT holder and a central game controller. Accordingly, the RSAT holder is not capable of receiving any wagering request and/or transmitting any game outcome responses encrypted or otherwise.

Claim 80 also recites wherein said game controller utilizes a random number generating means separately and independently to generate each game outcome response to each said wagering request. Franchi is again silent regarding the generation of random game outcomes by the central computer or controller.

Similarly, Gimmon discloses downloading of financial information but is silent on data encryption keys or anything related to encryption. Gimmon also fails to disclose generating random game outcomes by a central computer and transmission of wagering

results and game outcomes between the central computer and player-operated gaming terminals as specifically recited in claim 80.

Walker is directed to lottery-type, finite-series applications (column 5, lines 3-12) whereas claim 80 recites real-time generation of game outcomes which are wholly independent from any and all other game outcomes (i.e., not finite). Walker also fails to disclose anything about dispensers and discloses only one communication channel between the central computer and the player-operated terminal.

Paulsen is directed to cashier-operated terminals and fails to disclose a dispenser. Claim 80 specifically recites said game controller configured to transmit said at least one data encryption key to said at least one gaming device via said first communication channel automatically and without involvement of personnel of a gaming establishment operating said dispenser.

Applicants contend that the new claim 80 is not rendered obvious by Franchi, Gimmon, Walker or Paulsen, individually, or any possible combination thereof. Consequently, as claim 80 is not rendered obvious nor can dependent claims 81-86 be rendered obvious.

## II. Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance and, accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. Should any questions remain regarding the allowability of the application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Greenberg Traurig  
3773 Howard Hughes Pkwy.  
Suite 500 North  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
Telephone : 702-792-3773  
Facsimile : 702-792-9002

Respectfully submitted,

By:

  
Rob L. Phillips  
Registration No. 40,305

Date: April 14, 2008